

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FOUR

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

GUADALUPE MOLINA RAMOS,

Defendant and Appellant.

B248546

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. TA111850)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
Arthur M. Lew, Judge. Affirmed.

Edward H. Schulman, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

This is the second appeal brought by defendant Guadalupe Molina Ramos. His initial appeal followed a conviction by jury of multiple counts of lewd acts upon several child victims. As relevant here, the jury also found defendant had committed the crimes against multiple victims within the meaning of Penal Code section 667.61, subdivision (b) (the “One Strike” law). We determined that the trial court improperly imposed the 15-year-to-life sentence required by that section for one of the counts, continuous sexual abuse (Pen. Code, § 288.5, subd. (a)), because the sentencing scheme under the One Strike law did not apply to the crime of continuous sexual abuse at the time defendant committed the offense. We rejected the remainder of defendant’s contentions and remanded the matter for resentencing. After defendant was resentenced, he filed the instant appeal. Finding no error, we affirm.

BACKGROUND

Given that this appeal involves only the sentence defendant received after remand, a review of the facts is unnecessary. On April 30, 2013, the trial court conducted a sentencing hearing. As it did when it initially sentenced defendant, the court imposed six consecutive 15-year-to-life terms. For the continuous sexual abuse count, it sentenced defendant to a concurrent 12-year term. This appeal followed.

DISCUSSION

Defendant’s appointed counsel filed a brief raising no issues and asked this court to independently review the record pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Counsel submitted a declaration stating he had advised defendant of the nature of the brief that would be filed.

On August 27, 2013, we sent a letter to defendant advising him that he had 30 days within which to file a supplemental brief raising any issues he wished for us to consider. To date, we have received no response.

We have independently reviewed the record. We are satisfied that no arguable issues exist and that defendant has, by virtue of counsel's compliance with the *Wende* procedure and our independent review of the record, received effective appellate review of the judgment entered against him. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-279; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 123-124.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

SUZUKAWA, J.

We concur:

EPSTEIN, P. J.

MANELLA, J.